

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following additional remarks which are intended to supplement the previous remarks filed in Applicants' Amendment of June 24, 2008.

I. Rejection of the Claims 4, 17, and 19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated January 25, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 4, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pandya* in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 20040117438 by Considine et al. ("*Considine*"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of *Pandya* and *Considine* fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 4, 17, and 19. In particular, claims 4, 17, and 19 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 7 and thus recite at least the same features. As discussed in Applicants' Amendment filed on June 24, 2008, amended claims 1 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over *Pandya* for at least reciting "read operations are implemented using RDMA and write operations are implemented using send operations, wherein the write operations are not implemented using RDMA."

Considine fails to cure the deficiencies of *Pandya*. *Considine* merely discusses a switching system utilizing the SMB protocol (see paragraph 0085) and further discusses that various flags can be used to denote whether data flow entry is relative to the source or destination of the flow (see paragraph 0528). *Considine* however, fails to discuss RDMA or the implantation of read operations using RDMA in connection with offloading an input/output (I/O) task from a first computer to a second computer, as recited in claims 4, 17, and 19. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of *Pandya* and *Considine* fails. Accordingly,

claims 4, 17, and 19 are distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5064

Date: October 7, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

